

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 11 and 14 have been amended for clarification purposes only. Claims 1-14 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4, 7-10 AND 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY KLUG ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,790,785; HEREINAFTER “KLUG”)(previously cited):

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a database held by an integrated membership management center, wherein when a user makes an application for a registration of membership information at one of the service provision sites by using said apparatus, the one of the service provision sites receiving the application registers at least a part of the membership information into the database held by the one of the service provision sites, and when the user is not registered in the database held by the integrated membership management center, the integrated membership management center registers the membership information of the user into the database held by the integrated membership management center, wherein the membership information comprises a user ID and a password and the integrated membership management center allows the user to use a same user ID and password through the service provision sites.

Klug fails to disclose “when a user makes an application for a registration of membership information at one of the service provision sites by using said apparatus, the one of the service provision sites receiving the application registers at least a part of the membership information into the database held by the one of the service provision sites, and when the user is not registered in the database held by the integrated membership management center, the integrated membership management center registers the membership information of the user into the database held by the integrated membership management center”, as recited in amended claim 1.

Instead, Klug discloses a WWW registration website used as a repository for registration information so that the user can request this registration information to be transmitted to another website to which the user desires to register (see column 1, line 60- column 2, line 2).

That is, in Klug, the user is not making “an application for a registration of membership information at one of the service provision sites by using said apparatus...and when the user is

not registered in the database held by the integrated membership management center, the integrated membership management center registers the membership information of the user into the database held by the integrated membership management center,” as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, in Klug the user either registers directly at the registration website or at user’s client node of the user’s WWW browser via an optional registrar registration module (see column 2 lines 37-49).

Therefore, the teachings of Klug are fundamentally different from that of the present invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 5-6, 11-12 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KLUG IN VIEW OF HUNT ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,496,855; HEREINAFTER “HUNT”)(newly cited):

At page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Klug fails to recite all of the features recited in claim 5. However, the Examiner asserts that Hunt makes up for the deficiency of Klug.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that FIG. 5 of Hunt discloses when a user is already registered at a third party web site, the user’s registration information is automatically transferred to the central registration database (RAS).

FIG. 5 of Hunt discloses a case when an Internet user is already a member of both the RAS and a particular website. In this case, the user is seeking a more convenient way to sign in to the website. As shown in FIG. 5, the user clicks on the RAS button and a RAS pop-up window appears over the browser window of the particular website. The user enters their user name and password for the RAS and selects the option that says that they are already a member of the particular website. The user then clicks “enter” and a new page appears with a request for the user’s current login details for the particular site (see column 8, lines 56-67). Further, the user enters their current login details for the particular site and then clicks the enter button. The user’s RAS home page then appears showing the particular site as a registered site. A personal profile for this site is created and stored in the user’s profile database for future

use (see column 9, lines 1-4). That is, in Hunt, the user is already a member of the central registration database (RAS) and a member of the particular website.

Neither Klug nor Hunt, individually or combined, recite "the integrated membership management center comprising "a database registering the new membership information when the searching unit determines that the user is not registered in the database," as recited in amended claim 5.

In claim 5 of the present invention, for example, the user is not already a member of the service provision site and may not already be a member of the integrated membership management center.

Further, similar to the teachings of Klug, in Hunt, the user registers with the RAS database first, and in response to a request from the user to a registration agent computer of RAS, to register the user at the service computer, submitting an application to register the user with the service computer by transmitting registration information from the RAS database to the service computer (see column 2, lines 10-17). That is, whenever a user wants to register at a desired site, the user logs onto the RAS system and request that the RAS system register the user at the desired website. Thus, the teachings of Hunt are also fundamentally different from that of the present invention.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Hunt fails to make up for the deficiency of Klug based upon the reasons mentioned above. Therefore, the combination of Klug and Hunt fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/4/05

By: Deidre M. Davis

Deidre M. Davis

Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501